

# Compendium of Results From Firing Different Explosively Formed Projectiles

Darren McQueen DSTO-TR-1479

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

20040122 017



## Compendium of Results From Firing Different Explosively Formed Projectiles

Darren McQueen

Weapons Systems Division Systems Sciences Laboratory

DSTO-TR-1479

### **ABSTRACT**

This compendium assembles the results from a series of firings utilising different variations of Explosively Formed Projectiles (EFP'S). Variations were applied to the design of the liner, casing and explosive.

Following computer numerical modelling, short listed candidates were manufactured and fired into steel witness plates. The results were then tabulated accordingly. Also used during the firing phase was Flash radiography (FXR) to study velocity and flight characteristics.

**RELEASE LIMITATION** 

Approved for public release

AQ F04-03-0223

### Published by

DSTO Systems Sciences Laboratory PO Box 1500 Edinburgh South Australia 5111 Australia

Telephone: (08) 8259 5555 Fax: (08) 8259 6567

© Commonwealth of Australia 2003 AR-012-868 August 2003

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE

# Compendium of Results From Firing Different Explosively Formed Projectiles

### **Executive Summary**

There is a growing appreciation for the use of Explosively Formed Projectiles (EFP'S) in military and civilian applications today. For example, EFP's can be found in various missile systems, detonators, and demolition charges. The original tasking that led to this report was for the application of EFP's to explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) operations.

This compendium brings together the results, (in a tabulated format), produced by firing various EFP's into a steel witness plate. It does not make recommendations as to which style may be better than another but will enlighten the reader and charge designers as to the possible performance of several different combinations of constraints applied to the liner design, casing and explosive. By no means does this compendium cover all the combinations available and this report should demonstrate that fact.

The study used finite element modelling (PC-DYNA 2D) to achieve a list of potential candidates for further investigation. These were manufactured and tested in the explosive firing chambers at DSTO. The set up involved firing the charges at different standoff distances above the steel plate, and multiple flash radiography (FXR) to capture the EFP in flight to record a velocity.

Once the firings were completed the witness plates were sectioned in half and the depth of hole, entry diameter and profile of the hole were obtained. The results are all tabulated and presented in the Appendix 1.

The results demonstrate that changing any characteristic of an EFP design, such as liner profile, material or amount of explosive used will influence the performance.

### **Author**

### Darren McQueen

Weapons Systems Division

Darren McQueen joined DSTO in 1987 as a technical officer and since graduated with a Bachelor of Technology in Mechanical Engineering and Management from Deakin University in 2001. He has worked on investigations into the effectiveness of explosive filled ordnance, explosively formed projectiles for low order dispoal techniques, seamine neutralisation research and vehicle and personnel vulnerability to landmines.

## **Contents**

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
		_
2.	EXPERIMENTAL	1
	2.1 Hydrocode modelling	1
	2.2 Set Up	2
	2.3 Flash Radiography	4
	and I such I such a suc	
3.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	5
4.	CONCLUSIONS	.8
5	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	8
J.	MCM TO WELL TO SERVICE	_
6	REFERENCES	.8
U.	ILI LILI (CL)	
A T	PRINTLY A. INDEX TO PENETRATION PROFILE CHARTS	9

### 1. Introduction

The concept of Explosively Formed Projectiles (EFP's) uses explosive energy to deform a metal plate into a coherent penetrator while accelerating it to velocities up to 3000m/s [1]. Unlike traditional shaped charges, which tend to form long rod penetrators, an EFP will put most of its original mass into forming what appears to be a solid mass or slug (however its true form in some variants may also be likened to that of a hollow sheath).

The final shape and performance of the EFP will depend upon a number of parameters. These include the type and amount of explosive used, case confinement and material, liner shape, thickness, profile, material and peculiarities applied to the liner such as localised heat treatment or performance enhancing grooves.

It can be seen from this list of parameter variables that an in-exhaustive variety of charges could be created and used for a similar number of applications. However this compendium will only present a range of results that were investigated for a specific application. That being, a penetrator that could produce a large diameter hole with respect to the size of the charge and be able to penetrate approximately 15mm of mild steel for the purpose of explosive ordnance disposal (EOD).

Computer modelling [2] was applied and the DYNA 2D hydrocode became a very useful tool in evaluating specific charges. Once a charge design had been agreed upon, its parameters were fed into the hydrocode and the results produced from this code demonstrated the expected penetrator in flight and the expected profile into mild steel.

### 2. Experimental

### 2.1 Hydrocode modelling

The design and penetration of many of the candidate configurations were modelled using the Dyna 2D hydrocode. Table 1 lists the material models used for the explosive, liner and case materials. Although the explosive PE4 (88% RDX/11% plasticizer/1% pentaerythritol di-oleate) was used, no material model data exists for computational predictions and therefore the material data for Composition C4 was used in the computations since it has a similar composition (91% RDX/9% polyisobutylene). The initial aim of the Dyna modelling was to produce a liner and projectile that could be used for explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) by creating a low order event. A large number of EFP designs were modelled. Variable parameters were liner design and material and explosive configuration and confinement. Suitable designs were fabricated and the computational predictions were validated using flash radiography instrumented firings to determine projectile shape, velocity and stability during flight.

Table 1. Material data used in EFP simulations.

	Copper	Composition C4	Aluminium	Plexiglass
Material Model	Johnson-Cook	High Explosive Burn	Steinberg- Guinan	Steinberg- Guinan
Equation of State	Gruneisen	JWL	Gruneisen	Gruneisen

### 2.2 Set up

The penetration capability of the EFP is directly related to its shape and velocity at impact and to obtain a particular profile, all the varying parameters of the EFP design must first be considered. Influence of the parameters on EFP performance were first investigated computationally. All charges utilised the plastic explosive filling known as PE4.

The components for the charge design wherever possible were always based on common commercially available materials. The simple charge, as seen in figure 1, is based upon a detonator locator made of Perspex, a cylindrical charge case of an appropriate length of aluminium (usually 3mm thick) and various liners. The major parameters investigated included thickness, profile and material of the liner. The types of materials considered included high conductivity copper, aluminium to grade 5005, low carbon steel to grade 1010, magnesium, zirconium, borosilicate glass and various forms of plastics.

Validation of the modelling using the manufactured components was carried out inside a small scale firing chamber and involved placing the charge, (hand filled with PE4) on a PolyVinylChloride (PVC) tube which stood on a mild steel witness block. For each firing, the length of the PVC tube was varied according to a multiple of the charge diameter to provide a series of results over different standoff distances. Figure 2 demonstrates the basic set up of the charge, the PVC tube, steel witness plate and the Flash X-Ray (FXR) cassettes used in each of the test firings.




Figure 1 Simple charge design.




Figure 2 Charge set up.

### 2.2 Flash Radiography

Four flash x-ray cassettes were placed around the charge (figure 3) to capture the EFP projectile in flight and to calculate the velocity of the projectile. These experiments were carried out using a four-channel FXR system comprising two orthogonal 300kv and two orthogonal 600kv pulsers. Arranged around the central axis of flight, as shown in figure 3.




Figure 3 Set-up of the charge and FXR cassettes.

The FXR pulsers were triggered electrically from the firing signal to an Exploding Bridgewire (EBW) detonator. A time delay for the EFP to reach nominal positions was estimated using the computer modelling. These estimates were used as the triggering delays for the FXR, and allowed comparison of expected positions with actual positions. Images were recorded by a film and the florescent intensifying screen combination placed in a protective cassette and positioned near the charge. EFP projectile velocities were calculated from the radiographic images and recorded times [3].

### 3. Results and Discussion

Once the experiments were completed the witness blocks were sectioned in half longitudinally. Sectioning allowed measurement of the entry hole diameter, depth of penetration to the deepest point of the hole and the profile of the hole to be recorded.

The depth of penetration was taken from the horizontal of the block face and not the crest of the expelled metal wave created around the hole. Each firing was carried out once and the results presented represent that firing and not a series of firings with the same liner and set-up conditions.

Once all the firings of a given charge were completed, the information was collated and presented in the form of penetration profile charts, these profile charts are presented in appendix 1. These charts represent a graphical presentation setting out all the recorded data and hole profiles for each of the charges tested. In many cases, profile charts were completed to have a comparative record of between liners of a similar design but with a single parameter varied.

Modelling and experimental firings have investigated a large range of parameters that can be applied to EFP design. They have included;

- 1. liner geometry and material,
- 2. case confinement, and
- charge diameter and length.

Each variation will affect the performance of the EFP differently. Comparing several penetration profile charts of the same liner but with differing amounts of explosive behind the liner, head height, it can be seen that there is a difference in the penetration performance and velocity. Increasing the amount of explosive used increases the velocity of the EFP projectile, elongation of the shape of the EFP, thus creating a deeper and narrower hole. Altering the case thickness or case material, again would change the penetration performance. It can be seen that as the case material increases in density or thickness, there will be an increase in velocity, penetration and narrowing of the entry diameter. These observations indicate that the manipulation of the detonation front through the explosive will change the result achieved by the liner. Only a small number of variations were investigated as time was limited and there was a specific requirement to develop an EOD technique.

Flash radiography provided many detailed images of EFP's in flight. Images of solid projectiles, hollow projectiles, long rod projectiles and fragmenting projectiles were obtained and compared to the modelling predictions. The agreement was generally quite good and a typical example of the radiographs is shown in figure 4. However, the FXR did have a few problems trying to resolve some of the lower density projectiles in both the glass and plastics range of liners.





Figure 4 Flash x-ray images of the projectile from a conventional copper EFP.

Figures 5 and 6 demonstrate the modelling results obtained from Dyna and these can be traced against the x-ray images of the EFP's, during flight through air. It was somewhat difficult to compare the interior shapes of some of the projectiles as they are not fully visible on the FXR due to varying material densities. However the predicted shape and size of the EFP's at different time sequences agree reasonably well with the x-ray tracings when placed alongside each other. Likewise, a good correlation with experiment of the EFP impact velocity was achieved. The complete EFP formation process according to the numerical simulation requires around 80 to 100µs after initiation with subsequent projectile velocity stabilisation. A minor discrepancy that was observed is that the predicted EFP's appeared to have collapsed sooner than the experimental projectile. This may be due to a delay in the detonator functioning time that results in a temporal displacement in the comparison.



(a) 60 mm diameter liner (b) 80 mm diameter liner (c) 80 mm diameter liner

Figure 5 Dyna 2D outputs for the penetration into mild steel of three different designs of EFP's. The liner diameters are as indicated with variation in the charge diameter and the geometry of the liner contour radii giving rise to the different penetration profiles.




Figure 6 Dyna 2D penetration of a mild steel target by a low carbon steel donut liner (intervals of approximately 50 microseconds).

### 4. Conclusions

This compendium has brought together the results of a large body of work involving computer modelling, manufacture, experimental validation and data analysis with respect to EFP performance. It demonstrates that changing one parameter at a time, varies the velocity of the jet/slug, the penetration into steel and/or the shape of hole produced. These variations have a dramatic affect on the final outcome where for EOD operations could mean the difference between a detonation or a low order burn of the explosive filling.

Although only a relatively small number of firings with respect to the number of possible variations were undertaken in this study, the information provided offer the reader an enlightened view of the expected performance of various EFP designs.

### 5. Acknowledgments

The author would like to express their gratitude to Mr. Mick Chick for his guidance, Mr. Tim Bussell and Mrs. Lyn McVay for their assistance experimentally, Mr. Chanphu Lam for his valuable assistance with the computer modelling and Mr. Trevor Kinsey for his guidance with the flash radiography.

### 6. References

- [1] Carleone, J., Tactical Missile Warheads, volume 155, Progress in Astronautics and Aeronautics.
- [2] Lam, C., and McQueen, D. Numerical Simulations of the Formation and Penetration of Explosively Formed Projectiles, Proceedings of the Seventh Biennial Conference of Computational Techniques and Applications: CTAC 95.
- [3] Chick, M., Bussell, T., McQueen, D. and Lam, C. The Cookie-Cutter Explosively Formed Projectile: Its Development and Applications including Explosive Ordnance Disposal, DSTO-TR-0919, February 2000.

### Appendix A

### Index to penetration profile charts:

Abbreviations; PMMA - Perspex

dia. - diameter

alum - aluminium

thk - thick

H.H. - Head Height

\* - incomplete chart

PVC - Polyvinyl chloride

deg - degrees

Hemi - Hemispherica

R - radius

c.d. - charge diameter

S.D. - Standoff

### 1. Copper liners

- 38mm dia x 42 deg x 1.0mm thk x 2/3 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 38mm dia. x 90 deg x 1.0mm thk x 2/3 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 38mm dia. x 140 deg x 1.0mm thk x 1 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 38mm dia. x flat disc x 1.0mm thk x 1 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 38mm dia. x flat disc x 1.5mm thk x 1 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 38mm dia, x R80 x 1.0mm thk x 1 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 38mm dia. x R40 x 1.0mm thk x 1 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 38mm dia. x R40 x 1.0mm thk x 1 c.d. H.H. x alum case segmented grooves
- 38mm dia. x R40 x 1.0mm thk x 1/2 c.d. H.H. x PMMA case
- 38mm dia. x R30 x 0.9mm thk x 1 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 38mm dia. x R30 x 0.9mm thk x 1/2 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 38mm dia. x R30 x 1.6mm thk x 1 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 38mm dia. x R25 x 1.0mm thk x 1 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 38mm dia. x Hemi. x 1.0mm thk x 1c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 60mm dia. x R60 x 2.0mm thk x 1/4 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 60mm dia. x R60 x 2.0mm thk x 1/3 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 60mm dia. x R60 x 2.0mm thk x 1/3 c.d. H.H. x PMMA case
- 60mm dia. x R60 x 2.0mm thk x 1/3 c.d. H.H. x alum case water penetration
- 60mm dia. x R60 x 2.0mm thk x 2/3 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 60mm dia, x R60 x 2.0mm thk x 1/3 c.d. H.H. x alum case 1/16in rubber backed
- 80mm dia. x R80 x 2.0mm thk x 1/4 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 40mm dia. x Contour (2.0 1.0) x 1/4 c.d. H.H. x alum case

### 2. Aluminium liners

- 38mm dia. x 140 deg x 1.0mm thk x 1 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 38mm dia. x R40 x 1.0mm thk x 1 c.d. H.H. x alum case

- 38mm dia. x R30 x 1.0mm thk x 1 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 38mm dia. x R25 x 1.0mm thk x 1 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 38mm dia. x Hemi x 1.0mm thk x 1 c.d. H.H. x alum case

### 3. Low carbon steel liners

- Mk 2 Mod 1 Point Focal Charge
- 40mm dia. x Contour (2.0 1.5) x 1 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 38mm dia.  $\times$  R40  $\times$  1.95mm thk  $\times$  1 c.d. H.H.  $\times$  alum case
- 60mm dia. x R60 x 1.95mm thk x 1/3 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 60mm dia. x R60 x 1.95mm thk x 1/2 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 60mm dia. x R60 x 1.95mm thk x 1/2 c.d. H.H. x PMMA case

### 4. Contoured liners (low carbon steel)

- 25mm dia. x TUB 20 x 1/2 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 60mm dia. x TUB 04 x 1/3 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 60mm dia. x Type A x 1/3 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 60mm dia. x Type B x 1/4 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- -80mm dia. x Type C x 1/4 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- -80mm dia. x TUB 12 x 1/4 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- -80mm dia. x TUB 13C x 1/4 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- -80mm dia. x TUB 17 x 1/4 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- -80mm dia. x Refined x 1/4 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- \_ 80mm dia. x Refined x 1/4 c.d. H.H. x PMMA case

### 5. Glass liners


- 60mm dia. x 90 deg x 2.0mm thk x 1/3 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 60mm dia. x 60 deg x 4.0mm thk x 1/3 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 60mm dia. x 90 deg x 4.0mm thk x 1/4 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 60mm dia. x 90 deg x 4.0mm thk x 1/3 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 60mm dia. x 105 deg x 4.0mm thk x 1/4 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 60mm dia. x 105 deg x 4.0mm thk x 1/3 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 60mm dia. x 110 deg x 4.0mm thk x 1/3 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 60mm dia. x 120 deg x 4.0mm thk x 1/4 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 60mm dia. x 120 deg x 4.0mm thk x 1/2 c.d. H.H. x alum case
- 60mm dia. x Hemi x 4.0mm thk x 1/4 c.d. H.H. x alum case


### 6. Pyrophoric liners

- 60mm dia. x R40 x 4.0mm thk x 1/3 c.d. H.H. x alum case x cast magnesium
- 60mm dia x R60 x 4.0mm thk x 1/3 c.d. H.H. x alum case x cast magnesium
- 60mm dia. x R60 x 4.0mm thk x 1/2 c.d. H.H. x alum case x cast magnesium
- 60mm dia. x R60 x 3.3mm thk x 1/3 c.d. H.H. x alum case x zirconium
- 60mm dia. x R60 x 3.3mm thk x 1/2 c.d. H.H. x alum case x zirconium
- 60mm dia. x R40 x 4.0mm thk x 1/3 c.d. H.H. x alum case x sheet magnesium
- 60mm dia. x R40 x 4.0mm thk x 1/3 c.d. H.H. x alum case x aluminium

### 7. Plastic liners

- 38mm dia. x 90 deg x 1.0mm thk x 52mm H.H. x alum case x Teflon
- 38mm dia. x R40 x 1.0mm thk x 66mm H.H. x alum case x Teflon
- 38mm dia. x 90 deg x 1.0mm thk x 52mm H.H. x alum case x Nylon
- \* 38mm dia. x R40 x 1.0mm thk x 66mm H.H. x alum case x Nylon
- \* 38mm dia. x 140 deg x 1.0mm thk x 64mm H.H. x alum case x Nylon
- \* 38mm dia. x Hemi x 1.0mm thk x 52mm H.H. x alum case x Nylon
- \* 38mm dia. x 90 deg x 1.0mm thk x 52mm H.H. x alum case x Polyethylene
- \* 38mm dia. x 90 deg x 2.0mm thk x 52mm H.H. x alum case x Polyethylene
- \* 38mm dia. x 90 deg x 3.0mm thk x 52mm H.H. x alum case x Polyethylene
- \* 38mm dia. x 140 deg x 1.0mm thk x 64mm H.H. x alum case x Polyethylene
- \*38mm dia. x R40 x 1.0mm thk x 66mm H.H. x alum case x Polyethylene
- \* 38mm dia. x Hemi x 1.0mm thk x 52mm H.H. x alum case x Polyethylene
- 38mm dia. x 90 deg x 1.0mm thk x 52mm H.H. x alum case x PVC
- 38mm dia. x 90 deg x 2.0mm thk x 52mm H.H. x alum case x PVC
- 38mm dia. x 90 deg x 3.0mm thk x 52mm H.H. x alum case x PVC
- \* 38mm dia. x 90 deg x 4.0mm thk x 52mm H.H. x alum case x PVC
- TO THE POST OF THE
- \* 38mm dia. x 90 deg x 5.0mm thk x 52mm H.H. x alum case x PVC
- \* 38mm dia. x 90 deg x 6.0mm thk x 52mm H.H. x alum case xPVC
- 38mm dia. x 140 deg x 1.0mm thk x 64mm H.H. x alum case x PVC
- 38mm dia. x 140 deg x 1.0mm thk x 52mm H.H. x alum case x PVC
- \* 38mm dia. x 105 deg x 1.0mm thk x 52mm H.H. x alum case x PVC
- 38mm dia. x 75 deg x 1.0mm thk x 46mm H.H. x alum case x PVC
- 38mm dia. x 60 deg x 1.0mm thk x 38mm H.H. x alum case x PVC
- 38mm dia x 45 deg x 1.0mm thk x 25mm H.H. x alum case x PVC
- 38mm dia. x R40 x 1.0mm thk x 66mm H.H. x alum case x PVC
- 38mm dia. x Hemi x 1.0mm thk x 33mm H.H. x alum case x PVC
- \* 38mm dia. x 90 deg x 1.0mm thk x 52mm H.H. x PMMA case x PVC
- 38mm dia. x 90 deg x 1.0mm thk x 1 c.d. S.O. x alum case x PVC varying H.H.





PENETRATION

ENTRY DIA.


15

2

140° COPPER LINER

(C.D.) 0 1 2 4 6 8 10 TER (mm) 36 32 14 12 17 13 11 (mm) (mm) 30 34 42 71 52 49 53				\ \	
0     1     2     4     6     8     10       36     32     14     12     17     13     11     (       30     34     42     71     52     49     53	75	9	_	<u></u>	
0 1 2 4 6 8 36 32 14 12 17 13 30 34 42 71 52 49			EE)		
0 1 2 4 6 36 32 14 12 17 30 34 42 71 52		5	=	53	
0 1 2 4 36 32 14 12 30 34 42 71		8	13	67	
0 1 2 36 32 14 30 34 42		9	17	52	
0 1 36 32 30 34		4		71	
0 % %		2	14	42	
100FF (C.D.) 0 1Y DIAMETER (mm) 36 TRATION (mm) 30		1	32	34	
NDOFF (C.D.) TO DIAMETER (mm) TRATION (mm)		0	3%	30	
N DIAMET		(C.D.)	ER (mm)	(EE)	
STAN		STANDOFF	ENTRY DIAMET	PENETRATION	


J.T.V.= 2·7 mm/µs CHARGE 38mm dia. WITH 1C.D. HEAD HEIGHT.



FLAT COPPER DISC (1.0mm thk)

STANDOFF (C.D.)	0	-	2	3	7
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	54	87	39	0/	0/
PENETRATION (mm)	7	2	2	m	m

J.T.V. =  $2.9 \text{ mm/}\mu\text{s}$  CHARGE 38 mm dia. WITH 1 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT.





INSIGNIFICANT PENETRATION PROFILES

FLAT COPPER DISC (1.5mm thk)

STANDOFF (C.D.)	0	1	2	3
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	53	5†	07	53
PENETRATION (mm)	4	9	12	7

J.T.V. = 2.0 mm/µs CHARGE 38mm dia. WITH 1 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT.







# R 80 COPPER CAP

STANDOFF (C.D.	( )	2	7	9	8	10
ENTRY DIAMETER	( mm )	37	76	29	29	32
PENETRATION	(mm)	11	10	18	20	7

J.T.V = 2.9 mm/µs CHARGE 38 mm dia. WITH 1 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT.






# R 40 COPPER CAP

	ENTRY DIA.			PENETRATION
20	07	(mm)	20	=
	0	25 (n	7	1
	9 10	3 2	22 0	Ì
	3	28 23	31 26 26 30	
	9	28	7	
	7	12	97	
	2	26	٣	
	-	36	38	
ĺ	0	53	2	
	STANDOFF (C.D.)	ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	PENETRATION	JTV = 2.5 mm/us

J.T.V. = 2·5 mm/µs CHARGE 38 mm dia. WITH 1C.D. HEAD HEIGHT.




STANDOFF (C.D.)




R 40 COPPER CAP (SEGMENTED)

STANDOFF	(C.D.)		2	4	9	æ	유
ENTRY DIA	DIAMETER	(mm)	10	14	15	14	20
PENETRATION		(mm)	42	36	31	22	10

J.T.V. = 1.9 mm/µs CHARGE 38mm dia. WITH 1 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT.








 $R40 \times 1.0 \text{ mm}$  COPPER ( $\phi$ 38mm)

STANDOFF (C.D.)	)	2	4	9	8	10
ENTRY DIAMETER	( mm )	23	22	22	23	22
PENETRATION	( ww )	22	20	23	22	18


J.T.V. = 2.05 mm/us CHARGE FILLED TO 1/2 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT. PERSPEX CASE.










PENETRATION STANDOFF (C.D.) ENTRY DIA. 4.0 30 10 20 (EE) (19.0mm head height) 2 27 9 79 2 ጽ 77 22 HOLE PROFILES R 30 COPPER CAP ENTRY DIAMETER (mm) (E) (C.D.) J.T.V. = 2·0 mm/µs CHARGE 38 mm dia. PENETRATION STANDOFF











R 60 COPPER CAP (Ø 60 mm)

STANDOFF (C.D.)	2	4	5	7	2
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	35	38	5-17	1.7	33
PENETRATION (mm)	20	17	17	23	21

CHARGE FILLED TO 1/4 CD. HEAD HEIGHT. J.T.V. = 1.4 mm/µs







R 60 COPPER CAP (Ø60mm)

STANDOFF	(C.D.)	2	4	9	10
ENTRY DIAMETER	R (mm)	37	37	37	32.5
<b>PENETRATION</b>	( mm )	12	52	26	26

CHARGE FILLED TO 1/3 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT. J.T.V. =  $1.6 \,\text{mm/\mu s}$ 







 $R60 \times 2.0 \text{ mm} \text{ COPPER} (\phi 60 \text{ mm})$ 

STANDOFF	( C.D.)	2	4	9	89	10
ENTRY DIAMETER	TER (mm)	35	36	35	35	35
PENETRATION	( mm )	19	18	20	19	19

J.T.V. = 1·56 mm/us CHARGE FILLED TO 1/3 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT. PERSPEX CASE.







R 60 COPPER CAP (Ø60mm)

- 05	• •	(mm) 30	200
	55	20	7
	25   50   75   100   125   150	36 37 35 36 55 50	2
	100	36	7
	75	35	11
	20	37	21 18 11
	25	36	12
	WATER HEIGHT (mm)	ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	PENETRATION (mm)










R 60 COPPER CAP (Ø 60 mm)

STANDOFF (C.D.)	2	4	9	
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	1.7	37	88	
PENETRATION (mm)	36	88	07	

CHARGE FILLED TO 2/3 C.D HEAD HEIGHT. J.T.V. = 2·1 mm/µs









R 80 COPPER CAP ( \$80 mm)

STANDOFF (C.D.)	2	7	9	œ	2
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	<b>6</b> 3	42	77	94	8
PENETRATION (mm)	35	35	32	28	77

CHARGE FILLED TO 1/4 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT. J.T.V. =  $1.7 \text{ mm/}\mu\text{s}$ 







**\$40 Cu CONTOUR LINER (20-10)** 

STANDOFF (C.D.)	,	2	4	9	8	10
ENTRY DIAMETER	( ww )	35	18	19	32	62
PENETRATION	( ww )	23	33	33	30	77

J.T.V. = 2.0 mm/µs CHARGE FILLED TO 1 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT.







140° ALUMINIUM LINER

20	07	(mm) 30	20
	10	ನ	6
	8	18	18
	9	19	30
	4	20	25
	2	26	19
	0	07	7
	0FF (C.D.)	ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	PENETRATION (mm)
	STANDOFF	ENTRY	PENET

J.T.V. = 4·9 mm/µs CHARGE 38mm dia WITH 1 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT.







R 40 ALUMINIUM CAP

(CD.)	0	1	2	77	9
DIAMETER (mm)	53	07	30	29	30
PENETRATION (mm)	5	10	10	12	11

J.T.V. = 5·1 mm/µs CHARGE 38mm dia. WITH 1C.D. HEAD HEIGHT.










STANDOFF (C.D.)	0	2	-3	9	80	9	04	
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm	38	28	28	20	12	2	( mm)	
PENETRATION (mm)	7	11	15	ထ	12	2		
							7	


J.T.V. = 4.5mm/µs CHARGE 38mm dia. WITH 1C.D. HEAD HEIGHT.






R 25 ALUMINIUM CAP










## ALUMINIUM HEMISPHERE


		I	ľ	ľ	İ	ľ		3	
STANDOFF (C.	c.D. )	0	2	4	9	80	9	04	
ENTRY DIAMETER	( mm )	38	28	77	27	25	22	( <b>mm</b> )	
PENETRATION	( mm )	17	26	26	6	2	5	20	

J.T.V. = 5·4 mm/μs CHARGE 38mm dia. WITH 1 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT.












Ø 4.0 L.C.S. CONTOUR LINER (2:0-1:5)

STANDOFF (C.D.)		2	4	6	8	10
ENTRY DIAMETER	( mm )	36	35	37	78	96
PENETRATION	( mm )	12	8	12	14	14

J.T.V. = 1·7 mm/µs CHARGE FILLED TO 1 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT.










R 60 LOW CARBON STEEL CAP (Ø60mm)

STANDOFF (C.D.)	2	4	9	8	2
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	44	77 77 77	77	97	77
PENETRATION (mm)	15	12	15	15	14

CHARGE FILLED TO 1/3 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT. J.T.V. = 1.8 mm/µs









R 60 x 1.95mm LOW CARBON STEEL (Ø60mm)


STANDOFF (C.D.)		2	4	6	8	10
ENTRY DIAMETER	(mm)	42	42 42	07	39	07
PENETRATION (mm	<u>-</u>	21	13	13	18	71

CHARGE FILLED TO V2 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT. PERSPEX CASE.

 $J.T.V. = 1.93 \,\text{mm/us}$ 









Ø 60mm L.C.S. DONUT (TUB 04)

STANDOFF (C.D.)	2	4	9	80	
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	40	77	55	£\$	
PENETRATION (mm)	22	15	20	œ	

CHARGE FILLED TO 1/3 CD. HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE J.T.V. = 3·12 mm/µs







Ø60mm L.C.S. DONUT (TYPE A)

STANDOFF (C.D.)	2	4	9	80	10
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	77	38	37	38	33
PENETRATION (mm)	20	18	52	62	27

CHARGE FILLED TO 1/3 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE

J.T. V. = 2·38 mm/µs







\$60mm L.C.S. DONUT (TYPE B)


STANDOFF (C.D.)	2	4	9	8	10
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	07	39	31	77	37
PENETRATION (mm)	20	23	14	16	6

CHARGE FILLED TO 1/4 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE

J.T. V. = 2.58 mm/µs









STANDOFF (C.D.)	2	4	9	80	
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	07 85	40	20	63	
PENETRATION (mm)	31	28	20	21	










Ø 80 mm L.C.S. DONUT (TUB 12)

STANDOFF (C.D.)	1	2	7	9	
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	68	09	<b>9</b>	75	
PENETRATION (mm)	17	25	12	14	

CHARGE FILLED TO 1/4 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE J.T.V. = 2.96 mm/µs









Ø 80mm L.C.S. DONUT (TUB 17)


STANDOFF (C.D.)	1	2	4	9	
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	71	62	95	63	
PENETRATION (mm)	11	18	18	£	


CHARGE FILLED TO V4 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE

J.T. V. = 1.92 mm/µs










 $\phi$ 60mm × 90° × 2 mm GLASS × 1/3 H.H.

STANDOFF (C.D.)		2	3	7	5	9
ENTRY DIAMETER	( mm )	22	18	28	30	25
PENETRATION	( mm )	20	75	77	55	53


J.T.V = - mm/µs # FRAGILE LINER




PENETRATION

2

STANDOFF (C.D.)




DSTO-TR-1479




 $\phi$  60mm x 90° x 4mm GLASS x 1/4 H.H.

07	(mm) 30	8
9	30	23
5	<b>8</b> 8	30
4	<b>6</b> 3	18
3	28 23 32 43	28 35 42
2	23	35
1	28	88
)	( mm )	( mm )
(C.D.)	ETER	z
STANDOFF	ENTRY DIAMETER	PENETRATION


J.T.V. = 3.1 mm/µs







\$60mm x 90° x 4mm GLASS x 1/3 H.H.

<u>S</u>	07	) R	20	-
		(mm)		
	9	27	82	
	5	33		
	4	29	53	
	3	30	04	
	2	30 30 29 33	35 30 40 29 33	
	1	23	35	
	.)	( mm )	( mm )	
	( C.D.)	METER	NO	sri/ww
	STANDOFF	ENTRY DIAMETER	PENETRATION	J.T.V. = 3 · 8 mm/µs





STANDOFF





 $\phi$ 60mm x 105° x 4mm GLASS x 1/3 H.H.

- OC	07		50
		(EE)	
	9	25	2
	2	35	20
	7	36	20
	3	36 31 35 36 35	30
	2	31	33
	-	36	30 33 30 20 20
	)	( mm)	( mm )
	(C.D.)	METER	NO
	STANDOFF	ENTRY DIAMETER	PENETRATIO
	ST	EN.	PE

sn/ www -

J.T.V. =







STANDOFF

**PENETRATION** ENTRY DIA. STANDOFF (C.D.) 10 20 20 0,7 20 ( EE 50mm SCALE 34  $\phi$ 60 × 110 ° × 4 mm GLASS × 1/3 H.H. 25 25 12 41 ( EE ) ENTRY DIAMETER (mm) HOLE PROFILES ( C.D.) J.T.V. = 2.17 mm/us**PENETRATION** STANDOFF

 $\phi$  60mm x 120°x 4mm GLASS x 1/4 H.H.


		)  -  -		
50+	07	(mm) 30	20	10
	9	37	=	
	5	37	9 15 12 10 12 11	
	7	33	10	
	æ	40	12	
	2	35	15	
	l	43		
	.)	( mm )	( mm )	
	( C.D.)	HETER	N	sri/ww
	STANDOFF	ENTRY DIAMETER (mm) 43 35 40 33 37 37	PENETRATION	$J.T.V. = 2.17 \text{ mm /} \mu s$






 $\phi$  60mm × 120° × 4mm GLASS × 1/2 H.H.

ENTRY DIAMETER (mm) 45 35 42 45 45 37 (mm) 30.  PENETRATION (mm) 21 18 19 16 14 15 20.	STANDOFF (C.D.)	( )	1	2	Э	7	5	9	07	
(mm) 21 18 19 16 14 15	ENTRY DIAMETER	( mm )	45	35	74	45	45	37		
	PENETRATION	( mm )	21	18	19	16	14	15	· 8	J
									3	







\$60mm x HEMI. x 4mm GLASS x 1/4 H.H.

9 5 7 8	(mm) 39 25 26 25 18 29 (mm) 30	20 29 25 12 22 23
2	25	53
-	39	8
( C.D.)	METER (mm)	( mm )
STANDOFF	ENTRY DIAMETER	PENETRAT ION

J.T.V. = 4.1 mm/µs







\$60 x R40 x 4 mm MAGNESIUM (CAST)

STANDOFF (C.D.)	1	2	3	4	5
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	45	50	07	45	37
PENETRATION (mm)	14	12	7	11	13

CHARGE FILLED TO 1/3 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE

J.T.V. = 3.17 mm /  $\mu s$ 







R 60 x Ø60mm x 4mm CAST MAGNESIUM

STANDOFF (C.D.)	-	2	3	7	5
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	53	53	14	51	38
PENETRATION (mm)	6	10	11	7	80

CHARGE FILLÊD TO 1/3 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE.

J.T.V. = 3.085 mm/µs







R 60 x Ø60mm x 4mm CAST MAGNESIUM

STANDOFF (C.D.)		-	2	3	4	2
ENTRY DIAMETER	(mm)	95	53	20	52	51
PENETRATION (mm	m)	7	6	11	=	6

CHARGE FILLED TO 1/2 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE

J.T.V. = 3.42 mm/µs







R 60  $\times$   $\phi$ 60 mm  $\times$  3.3 mm ZIRCONIUM

STANDOFF (C.D.)	1	7	m	4	2
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	53	77	67	07	6.1
PENETRATION (mm)	8	ဆ	10	16	=

CHARGE FILLED TO 1/3 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE









R 60 x Ø60mm x 3.3mm ZIRCONIUM

STANDOFF (C.D.)		1	2	٣	4	2
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)		53	47	38	30	34
PENETRATION (mm)	·	10	17	13	22	21

CHARGE FILLED TO 1/2 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE

J.T.V. = 2.04 mm/µs







\$60 x R40 x 4mm MAGNESIUM (SHEET)

STANDOFF (C.D.)	1	2	3	7	2
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	57	23	20	55	₽ K
PENETRATION (mm)	9	8	7	7	min.

CHARGE FILLED TO 1/3 C.D. HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE


J.T.V. = 3-13 mm/µs







\$60 x R40 x 4 mm ALUMINIUM

STANDOFF (C.D.)	1	2	٣	4	2
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	50	L4	35	39	1.7
PENETRATION (mm)	13	16	14	16	=



JT.V. = 2.56 mm/µs







\$38mm x 90° TEFLON

STANDOFF (	( C.D)	1/2	1	11/2	2	3	
ENTRY DIAMETER	TER (mm)	34 30		32 25 31	25	31	(mm)
PENETRATION (mm)	( mm )	25	28	25 28 23 21 17	21	11	

CHARGE FILLED TO 52mm HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE
LINER 1mm THICK







\$38mm x R40 TEFLON

STANDOFF (C.D.)	1/2	1	11/2	2
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	37	32	33	33
PENETRATION (mm)	2	7	21	11

CHARGE FILLED TO 66mm HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE
LINER 1mm THICK







Ø 38 mm x 90° NYLON

STANDOFF (C.D.)	1/2	-	11/2	2
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	35	36	34	31
PENETRATION (mm)	16	20	18	18

CHARGE FILLED TO 52 mm HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE

LINER 1mm THICK








Ø 38 mm x R40 NYLON

STANDOFF (C.D.)	1/2	-	11/2	2
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)		33		32
PENETRATION (mm)		4		9

CHARGE FILLED TO 66 mm HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE
LINER 1mm THICK









STANDOFF (C.D.)

Ø38mm x NYLON HEMI.

STANDOFF (C.D.)	1/2	1	1 1/2	2
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)		40		32
PENETRATION (mm)		8		٤

CHARGE FILLED TO 52 mm HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE
LINER 1mm THICK







Ø 38 mm x 90° POLYETHYLENE

STANDOFF (C.D.)	1/2	-	112	2
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)		35		8
PENETRATION (mm)		71		6


CHARGE FILLED TO 52mm HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE

LINER 1mm THICK







Ø38 × 90° POLYETHYLENE




CHARGE FILLED TO 52mm HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE LINER 2mm THICK







Ø38 × 90° POLYETHYLENE











Ø 38 mm x 140° POLYETHYLENE

STANDOFF (C.D.)	1/2	1	11/2	2
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)		31		26
PENETRATION (mm)		11		9

CHARGE FILLED TO 64mm HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE LINER 1mm THICK







Ø 38 mm x R40 POLYETHYLENE

STANDOFF (C.D.)	1/2	1	1 1/2	2
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)		32		30
PENETRATION (mm)		L		9

CHARGE FILLED TO 66mm HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE LINER 1mm THICK







Ø 38 mm x POLYETHYLENE HEMI.


STANDOFF (C.D.)	1/2	-	1 1/2	2
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)		18		05
PENETRATION (mm)		9		2

CHARGE FILLED TO 52mm HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE LINER 1mm THICK





PENETRATION ENTRY DIA. (C.D.) STANDOFF \$ က္တ 9 20 ( mm ) 28 28 Ð CHARGE FILLED TO 52 mm HEAD HEIGHT 36 35 8 1/2 Ø38mm x 90° PVC ENTRY DIAMETER (mm) PENETRATION (mm) ALUMINIUM CASE STANDOFF (C.D.) PVC 1mm THICK





\$38mm x 90° PVC

STANDOFF (C.D.)	1/2	1	11/2	2
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	35	32	32	32
PENETRATION (mm)	19	17	18	91

50

CHARGE FILLED TO 52mm HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE
PVC 2mm THICK






Ф38 mm x 90° PVC


STANDOFF (C.D.)	1/2	1	2/11	2
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	36	34	34	36
PENETRATION (mm)	19	17	18	14

CHARGE FILLED TO 52 mm HEAD HEIGHT

ALUMINIUM CASE

PVC 3 mm THICK







വ STANDOFF (C.D.) ณ 50mm 40 30 20 50 10 (STANDOFF C.D.) (mm) SCALE CHARGE FILLED TO 52mm HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE LINER 4mm THICK ณ 1/2 1 3/2 34 20 ENTRY DIAMETER (mm) 35 15 PENETRATION (mm) HOLE PROFILES STANDOFF (C.D.) 1/2


Ø38 × 90° PVC

Ø38 × 90° PVC










S STANDOFF (C.D.) ณ 50mm 20 30 20 20 40 10 (STANDOFF C.D.) (ME) SCALE CHARGE FILLED TO 52mm HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE LINER 6mm THICK വ 3/5 28 19 1/2 28 15 ENTRY DIAMETER (MM) Ø38 × 90° PVC PENETRATION (mm) HOLE PROFILES STANDOFF (C.D.) 1/2


φ 38 mm × 140° PVC

STANDOFF (C.D.)	1/2	-	11/2	2
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	07	36	27	28
PENETRATION (mm)	12	13	13	12

CHARGE FILLED TO 64mm HEAD HEIGHT

ALUMINIUM CASE PVC 1 mm THICK






STANDOFF (C.D.) a 3/2 (STANDOFF C.D.) 50mm 20 30 20 40 10 (mm) SCALE CHARGE FILLED TO 52mm HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE LINER 1mm THICK വ 3/2 34 14 1/2 14 38 ENTRY DIAMETER (mm) PENETRATION (mm) HOLE PROFILES STANDOFF (C.D.) 1/2


Ø38 × 140° PVC

Ø38 × 105° PVC






വ




**∅38mm x 75° PVC** 

STANDOFF (C.D.)	1	2	3	4
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	34	31	28	30
PENETRATION (mm)	16	6	11	8









φ38mm x 60° PVC

STANDOFF (C.D.)	-	2	3	7
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	36	31	20	11
PENETRATION (mm)	11	15	8	12









φ38 mm × 45° PVC

STANDOFF (C.D.)	1	2	3	4
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	32	28	34	26
PENETRATION (mm)	18	80	7	m


CHARGE FILLED TO 25mm HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE

PV.C 1mm THICK






PENETRATION ENTRY DIA (C.D.) STANDOFF 20 50 9 30 9 (EE) 25 22 30 CHARGE FILLED TO 66 mm HEAD HEIGHT 33 32 36 1/2 Ø38mm x R40 PVC ENTRY DIAMETER (mm) PENETRATION (mm) ALUMINIUM CASE PVC 1mm THICK STANDOFF (C.D.)




Ø 38 mm x HEMISPHERICAL PVC


STANDOFF (C.D.)	1/2	-	112	2
ENTRY DIAMETER (mm)	43	41	38	07
PENETRATION (mm)	12	10	5	7


CHARGE FILLED TO 33mm HEAD HEIGHT ALUMINIUM CASE
PVC 1mm THICK







038 × 90° PVC









## DISTRIBUTION LIST

# Compendium of Results From Firing Different Explosively Formed Projectiles

## Darren McQueen

#### **AUSTRALIA**

DEFENCE ORGANISATION	No. of copies
Task Sponsor	_
Army	1
S&T Program	
Chief Defence Scientist	
FAS Science Policy	shared copy
AS Science Corporate Management	
Director General Science Policy Development	
Counsellor Defence Science, London	Doc Data Sheet
Counsellor Defence Science, Washington	Doc Data Sheet
Scientific Adviser Joint	1
Navy Scientific Adviser	Doc Data Sht & Dist List
Scientific Adviser - Army	1
Air Force Scientific Adviser	Doc Data Sht & Dist List
Scientific Adviser to the DMO M&A	1
Scientific Adviser to the DMO ELL	1
Director of Trials	1
Systems Sciences Laboratory	
Chief of Weapons Systems Division	Doc Data Sht & Dist List
Research Leader	Doc Data Sht & Dist List
Head	1
Task Manager	1
Author(s): Darren McQueen	1
DSTO Library and Archives	
Library Edinburgh	1 & Doc Data Sheet
Australian Archives	1
Capability Systems Division	
Director General Maritime Development	Doc Data Sheet
Director General Land Development	1
Director General Aerospace Development	Doc Data Sheet
Director General Information Capability Development	Doc Data Sheet
Office of the Chief Information Officer	
Chief Information Officer	Doc Data Sheet
Deputy CIO	Doc Data Sheet
Director General Information Policy and Plans	Doc Data Sheet
AS Information Structures and Futures	Doc Data Sheet
AS IIIOIHIAHOII SHACIMES AND PULLES	Doe Daw Sheet

AS Information Architecture and Management Director General Australian Defence Information Office Director General Australian Defence Simulation Office	Doc Data Sheet Doc Data Sheet Doc Data Sheet
Strategy Group Director General Military Strategy Director General Preparedness	Doc Data Sheet Doc Data Sheet
HQAST SO (Science) (ASJIC)	Doc Data Sheet
Navy Director General Navy Capability, Performance and Plans, 1	Navy Headquarters Doc Data Sheet
Director General Navy Strategic Policy and Futures, Navy F	
SO (Science), Deployable Joint Force Headquarters (DJFHQ) SO (Science) - Land Headquarters (LHQ), Victoria Barracks	ailed Doc Data Sheet (L), Enoggera QLD Doc Data Sheet
Intelligence Program  DGSTA Defence Intelligence Organisation  Manager, Information Centre, Defence Intelligence Organisa  Assistant Secretary Corporate, Defence Imagery and Geospa	
Doc Data Sheet	tial Organisation
	Doc Data Sheet
Doc Data Sheet  Defence Materiel Organisation  Head Airborne Surveillance and Control  Head Aerospace Systems Division  Head Electronic Systems Division  Head Maritime Systems Division	Doc Data Sheet Doc Data Sheet Doc Data Sheet Doc Data Sheet
Defence Materiel Organisation Head Airborne Surveillance and Control Head Aerospace Systems Division Head Electronic Systems Division Head Maritime Systems Division Head Land Systems Division  Defence Libraries Library Manager, DLS-Canberra	Doc Data Sheet

#### DSTO-TR-1479

Hargrave Library, Monash University Librarian, Flinders University	Doc Data Sheet 1
OUTSIDE AUSTRALIA	
INTERNATIONAL DEFENCE INFORMATION CENTRES	
US Defense Technical Information Center	2
UK Defence Research Information Centre	2
Canada Defence Scientific Information Service	1
NZ Defence Information Centre	1
ABSTRACTING AND INFORMATION ORGANISATIONS	
Library, Chemical Abstracts Reference Service	1
Engineering Societies Library, US	1
Materials Information, Cambridge Scientific Abstracts, US	1
Documents Librarian, The Center for Research Libraries, US	1
CD A DEC	5
SPARES	3
Total number of conies:	35

Page classification: UNCLASSIFIED

DEFENCE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ORGANISA DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA						PRIVACY MARKING/CAVEAT (OF DOCUMENT)		
2. TITLE  Compendium of Results From Firing Different Explosively Formed Projectiles				3. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION (FOR UNCLASSIFIED REPORTS THAT ARE LIMITED RELEASE USE (L) NEXT TO DOCUMENT CLASSIFICATION)  Document (U) Title (U) Abstract (U)				
4. AUTHOR(S)				5. CORPORATE AUTHOR				
Darren McQueen				Systems Sciences Laboratory PO Box 1500 Edinburgh South Australia 5111 Australia				
6a. DSTO NUMBER DSTO-TR-1479	6b. AR NUMBER AR-012-868			6c. TYPE OF REPORT Technical Report			7. DOCUMENT DATE August 2003	
8. FILE NUMBER 9505-21-176	9. TASK NUMBER ARM 03/051		10. TASK SPO	10. TASK SPONSOR ARMY		11. NO. OF PAGES 112		12. NO. OF REFERENCES 3
13. URL on the World Wide Web  http://www.dsto.defence.gov.au/corporate/reports/DSTO-TR-1479.				pdf Chief, Weapons Systems Division				
15. SECONDARY RELEASE STATEMENT OF THIS DOCUMENT  Approved for public release								
OVERSEAS ENQUIRIES OUTSIDE STATED LIMITATIONS SHOULD BE REFERRED THROUGH DOCUMENT EXCHANGE, PO BOX 1500, EDINBURGH, SA 5111  16. DELIBERATE ANNOUNCEMENT								
No Limitations								
17. CITATION IN OTHER DOCUMENTS Yes								
18. DEFTEST DESCRIPTORS  Explosively formed projectiles, velocity measurements, flight characteristics, mathematical models.								
19. ABSTRACT This compendium assembles the results from a series of firings utilising different variations of Explosively Formed Projectiles (EFP'S). Variations were applied to the design of the liner, casing and explosive. Following computer numerical modelling, short listed candidates were manufactured and fired into steel witness plates. The results were then tabulated accordingly. Also used during the firing phase was Flash radiography (FXR) to study velocity and flight characteristics.								

Page classification: UNCLASSIFIED